DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 012 95 UD 014 310

TITLE	An Evaluation of District Decentralized Projects--ESEA Title VII Program--in Community School District 14 of the New York City Public School System. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Institute for Educational Development, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	27p.; Function Number 420-330
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Decentralization; *English (Second Language); Kindergarten; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Preschool Programs; Primary Grades; *Program Evaluation; Reading Programs; *School Districts; Spanish Speaking; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII; *New York City

ABSTRACT

This is the final report of the Institute for Educational Development's evaluation of District 14's 1972-73 Title VII, 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act, program. The Bilingual Early Childhood Center Program has completed its third year of operation. This year the program served approximately 200 students divided into seven classes; one prekindergarten, two kindergarten, two first grade, and two second grade classes. The staff included a project director, two community-liaison workers, seven teachers, and 11 paraprofessionals. About 85 percent of the students were Spanish-dominant. The aim of the bilingual program is to offer a school program in which children receive instruction in both English and Spanish depending on language dominance. According to long-range objectives in the area of academic performance, students should be at or above grade level in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English by the end of the fourth grade. Furthermore, children should also be competent in Spanish. Another long-range goal is the creation of a positive orientation toward school. The instructional program consisted of language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, music, arts and crafts, and storytelling. The Distar instructional program was used for language arts and reading. (Author/JM)

ED 094012

AN EVALUATION OF DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED PROJECTS

- ESEA TITLE VII PROGRAM -

IN

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 14

OF THE NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

An evaluation of New York City Public School District 14 educational project funded under ESEA Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P1 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for 1972-73 school year.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

July 1973

UD 013 810

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
52 Vanderbilt Avenue
New York, New York 10017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Function Number	Program	Page
	Introduction	i
420-330	Bilingual Early Childhood Center	1
	Appendix A, Evaluation Staff	A1

INTRODUCTION

This final report of IED's evaluation of District 14's 1972-73 Title VII program reflects a level of cooperation between evaluation and program personnel which is not often attained. We want to take this opportunity to thank the director and her staff for all their efforts in helping us in whatever modest contribution IED may have toward the improvement of the program.

BILINGUAL EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTER

July 1973 | Function Number: 420-330

Operation: Recycled | Funding Source: Title VII

Grade Level: Pre K - 2 | Program Budget: $154,323

Program Site: PS 122

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Bilingual Early Childhood Center Program has completed its third year of operation. When the program began, there was a pre-kindergarten and a kindergarten class. In the succeeding two years of operation new prekindergarten, kindergarten, and off-the-street first grade classes (children with no prior school experience) were added to the program and the original students continued a the next grade level. This year, the program served approximately 200 students divided into seven classes: one prekindergarten, two kindergarten, two first grade and two second grade classes. The staff consisted of a project director, two community-liaison workers, seven teachers, 11 paraprofessionals, and a clerk-typist. The vast majority of the students were Spanish-dominant although about 10 or 15 percent of the students were English-dominant.

The aim of the bilingual program is to offer a school program in which children receive instruction in both English and Spanish depending upon language dominance. According to long-range objectives in the area of academic performance, students should be at or above grade level in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English by the end of the fourth grade. Furthermore, children should alsc

be competent in Spanish. Another long-range goal is the creation of a positive orientation toward school which should be reflected in a low dropout rate, low truancy, and low absenteeism. It is also expected that the program will foster pride in the children's native language and pride in Hispanic culture.

The instructional program consisted of language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, music, arts and crafts, and storytelling. The Distar instructional program was used for language arts and reading.

EVALUATION DESIGN

Although instruction took place in all subject areas, the evaluation testing centered on measuring reading and language production. Math skills were to be measured with an instrument jointly developed with the program staff; development has not been completed. All children received tests appropriate for their particular grade and language group.

Reading skills in English were measured with the use of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), Primary I or Primary II or the Distar Mastery Test (DMT). One first grade class and both second grade classes were tested with the MAT in April. All kindergarten, first, and second grade children reaching lesson 90 in the Distar program, (Distar has 360 Reading lessons) were tested with the DMT in December and again in May. The test is a criterion-referenced test; that is, students are measured against

a predesignated standard of performance, not against other students. The DMT measures students' mastery of Distar reading materials. The mastery level is set at 75%; i.e., 75% of all items must be correct for a student to be considered as having achieved mastery of the material he has completed.

A second major program area is language growth. To measure language development in the native language, the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts was given on a pretest-posttest basis in the fall and spring to kindergarten and first-grade children. The Boehm Test is designed to measure children's mastery of concepts necessary for achievement in the first years of school. These include, for example, concepts such as "bottom," "beside," "fast," "start," "easy," etc. The Boehm Test was developed and normed on an English-speaking population; however, the concepts the Boehm measures are universal. The test publishers translated the test into Spanish for use with a Spanish-speaking group. The available norms are used.

Language development in prekindergarten children was measured in the fall and again in the spring with the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Preschool Inventory. The ETS Preschool Inventory covers knowledge considered essential prerequisites for progress in the primary grades such as colors, number concepts, shapes, vocabulary, and following instructions.

To assess the English second-language acquisition program, Cervenka's Test of Basic Language Competence (abridged version) was used. The test is composed of four subtests: Oral Vocabulary, Sound Discrimination, Grammatical Discrimination, and Assimilation of Meaning. This test is designed to measure listening language competence of children learning a second language. It is used as a measure of language acquisition. Children taking this test in their native language are expected to score very high (approximately 90% or better). Therefore, children learning a second language who score high on all subtests are regarded as having mastery of that second language. For second language students, a score of 75% or better on a subtest is considered mastery of that subtest.

The Test of Basic Language Competence was given in English to Spanish-dominant students in January.

FINDINGS

Test Results

Test results are discussed in the following order: reading test results in English, MAT Primary I or II and DMT; followed by language data, Boehm, Preschool Inventory and Cervenka Test.

The MAT Primary I was administered to one of the two first grade classes in April. Only one class had progressed far enough in Distar and in English Mastery to be tested in English. Both second grade classes were also tested in April. The results are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

MEAN POSTTEST GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES
ON THE MAT PRIMARY I OR PRIMARY II FOR
FIRST AND SECOND GRADE CHILDREN

Subtest	(N=26) Grade 1	(N=55) Grade 2
Word Knowledge	2.3	2.7
Reading	2.5	2.6
Total Reading	2.4	2.7
Expected GE	1.7	2.7

In Table 1, actual grade equivalent scores for Word Knowledge, Reading, and Total Reading are compared with expected grade equivalents; these are national norm-group mean scores for the time of testing. The results for both first and second grade groups were excellent; the first grade children were 7 months above the expected GE and the second grade children were on grade level.

A second measure of reading in English is the Distar Mastery Test. Children in their second or third year of Distar (first and second graders) were tested with the DMT; Level I or Level II, in December. All K through 2nd grade children in the program were tested with the DMT in May. The DMT of Reading was given to measure what children learned in the Distar Reading program up to the time of testing. Children took Level I or II of the DMT, depending on whether they were studying Distar Reading I or II. Each test contains a group-administered written-response section and an individually-administered oral-response section. Each test is scored in three parts--A,B,C. There are 20 questions in each part. Students take all three parts, but mastery (75% correct or better) is expected only for the parts of the test corresponding to the number of Distar Reading lessons a child has completed. Satisfactory scores on part A reflect mastery of the work covered in part A; satisfactory scores on part B reflect mastery of the work covered in parts A and B; and satisfactory scores on part C

reflect mastery of the work covered in parts A, B, and C. The DMT is not meant to be given until the child has completed 90 lessons; therefore, children taking the DMT but not yet up to lesson 90 would not be expected to show mastery of any part. The chart below gives the details.

Test	Part	Lesson Range
DMT I	A	90 - 120
	B	121 - 140
	C	141 - 200
DMT II	A	201 - 220
	B	221 - 280
	C	281 or more

The MDT manual says that the goal should be that 100% of the children achieve mastery where expected. "The rationale for choosing 100% as the goal is that the students should have been taught all the skills that are being tested in these test parts." It does not seem reasonable, however, to expect all students to achieve mastery at a particular testing. Some students may not do well on that particular day; others may have trouble with the test format; etc. But if many students fail to achieve the criterion of mastery, then it must be assumed that such students are improperly placed in the program, that is, at a lesson too advanced for their achievement. On the other hand, if many students achieve beyond expectation, then it

must be assumed that such students are also improperly placed in the program, that is, at a lesson too easy for their achievement. Examples of over-achievement would be a student at Reading lesson 70 who achieves mastery of part A of the DMT I; or a student at lesson 215 who achieves mastery of parts A and B of the DMT II.

Based on these considerations, the evaluators have selected an arbitrary goal. We will examine the criterion that 80% of the students should achieve mastery scores of 75% correct responses on the parts of the DMT where mastery is expected. An underlined percentage indicates where mastery was expected. Table 2 presents the data for the Bilingual Early Childhood Center.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF KINDERGARTEN, FIRST, AND SECOND GRADE STUDENTS ACHIEVING MASTERY ON THE DISTAR MASTERY TEST OF READING

No. of Lessons Completed at Testing	Dec. 1972 (N= 70) Parts* N	A	B	C	May 1973 (N=108) Parts* N	A	B	C
DMT I								
Less than 90					5	40.0%	0%	0%
90-120	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	23	73.9	76.9	13.0
121-140	4	75.0	75.0	100.0	16	100.0	100.0	50.0
141-200	28	96.5	92.8	85.7	16	100.0	87.5	81.2
DMT II								
201-220	3	100.0	100.0	100.0	0			
221-280	25	80.0	72.0	44.0	7	57.1	42.9	14.3
More than 280	9	100.0	100.0	77.8	41	95.1	97.6	75.6

*Underlined percentages indicate where mastery was expected.

When tested in December, 70 students had completed lesson 90. One student was between lesson 90 and 120 at the time of testing, four students had completed lesson 120 but not 140, etc. Based on the criteria selected, the results were mixed; some groups of students met the criteria and some did not. For example, of the 25 students who completed lesson 221 but not 280, 72% of them (18 students) achieved mastery scores of 75% or better on the DMT; 80% was expected. The same results occurred in the May testing. Of the 7 students between lessons 221 and 280, 4 failed to achieve mastery on both part A and B where mastery was expected.

Although the great majority of students did achieve expected mastery, the evaluators believe that there is a need to identify children who have not achieved mastery in Distar and determine whether other kinds of help may be needed. Distar literature states that, "It is possible for virtually all children to be taught by the Distar program." The data presented here suggests that a few students were not succeeding in the program, although most students did meet the criteria for mastery.

A final word on the DMT data: We have discussed students who may be having trouble with Distar. It is possible that many other students who did very well on the DMT may be progressing too slowly, that is, could achieve more if advanced through the program faster. When we analyzed individual tests, it was common for students to be.

for example, at lesson 110 but achieving mastery of all three test parts of the DMT I, or at lesson 215 but achieving mastery of all three parts of the DMT II. Such a pattern suggests that the student should be allowed to skip lessons. The Distar Reading program has an advancement cycle for these students and the program coordinator reported that many students were being so advanced.

In summary, mastery of reading lessons content was taking place in the Bilingual Early Childhood Center. Some additional attention, however, must be given to students who may be at the extremes of achievement. A lesson cut-off point is suggested for slow students. When this point is reached for a specific student, his case should be brought to the attention of the Program Cooordinator. Provision can be made for special Distar help, an introduction to other reading techniques, or other means by which he can progress. The student who is mastering work beyond his present lesson placement needs to be advanced through the program faster. This student may also benefit from the opportunity to progress individually in supplemental reading materials. This is especially true for high achievers in their third year of the Distar Reading program.

Children at the kindergarten and first-grade level were tested in Spanish with the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts on a pretest-posttest basis. The pretest was given in December;

the posttest in May. Table 3 presents the Boehm results.

TABLE 3

MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST RAW SCORES AND PRECENTILE RANKS FOR THE BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS, (ADMINISTERED IN SPANISH) GRADE K AND 1

	Pretest (Dec.)*				Posttest (May)**			
			Percentile Rank				Percentile Rank	
Grade	N	Mean	Low	Middle	N	Mean	Low	Middle
K	37	25.1	35	10	33	32.4	40	5
1	43	33.8	20	5	39	41.8	45	5

*Midyear norms used.

**Beginning of year norms used; grade 1 norms for K students, grade 2 norms for 1st grade students.

On the Boehm, children's mean raw scores are converted into percentile ranks. The test manual has percentile ranks for low and middle socioeconomic groups. Middle socioeconomic norms should be used when a comparison with a middle-class population is wanted. Low socioeconomic norms should be used when a comparison with a lower socioeconomic population is wanted. Both sets of norms are presented in the table. The Boehm was normed at the beginning of the year (September and October) and at midyear (mid-November to late February). Therefore, midyear norms were used for the December pretesting. Beginning - of - year - norms

were used for the May posttesting. Kindergarten children tested in May were compared with children beginning grade 1; first-grade children tested in May were compared with children beginning grade 2.

Looking at the pretest scores first, we see that regardless of grade, the children were below the fiftieth percentile (below the norm group average). When posttested, the children remained (with one exception) in approximately the same percentile ranking as when posttested. This exception was the 25 increase in percentile rank for the 1st graders compared to a low socioeconomic group.

To measure language and concept development at the prekindergarten level, the classroom teachers gave the ETS Preschool Inventory individually to a sample of 10 children. The test was given in Spanish. The analysis of test scores is summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 4

PRE AND POSTTEST MEAN PERCENTILE RANKS
ON THE ETS PRESCHOOL INVENTORY (N = 10)

Pretest	Posttest	Mean Change
51.2	71.5	+20.3

On the pretest (December), the children's mean percentile rank (raw scores adjusted for age) was 51.2, approximately equal to the

national norm group average. When posttested in May, the children increased their ranking by 20.3 percentile ranks to a ranking of 71.5. While these results are extremely good, the very small sample size should make one cautious in their interpretation.

To measure second-language acquisition, the Cervenka Test of Basic Language Competence (TBLC) was used. Children taking this test in their native language (Spanish) score very high on each of the subtests (approximately 90% or better). Therefore, children learning a second language (English) who score high have approached mastery of that second language. For second-language students, a score of 75% or better on any subtest is considered mastery of that subtest. Mastery of a second language occurs when a student attains scores of 75% or better on all four subtests. Results for the first and second graders tested are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ATTAINING MASTERY (SCORES OF 75% OR BETTER) ON THE CERVENKA TEST OF BASIC LANGUAGE COMPETENCE

	Percentage Achieving Mastery			
	Grade 1		Grade 2	
Subtest	N	%	N	%
Oral Vocabulary	39	92%	25	96%
Sound Discrimination	31	3	20	75
Grammatical Discrimination	29	0	23	9
Assimilation of Meaning	--	--	23	70

An examination of Table 5 shows that the percentage of children achieving mastery on each subtest increased from grade 1 to grade 2, showing an increased knowledge of English on the part of the older children. Mastery levels for first grade children were very low when one notes that Oral Vocabulary is considered a screening test for the other three subtests. Only 3% of the first graders achieved mastery of Sound Discrimination and none of the 29 students tested achieved mastery of Grammatical Discrimination. The second grade picture is much improved over the first grade. Seventy-five percent of the second graders achieved mastery of Sound Discrimination and 70% achieved mastery of Assimilation of Meaning. The very low mastery level for Grammatical Discrimination was discussed with the test developer, Dr. Cervenka. Post studies completed by Dr. Cervenka suggest that a .6 to .7 correlation exists between Grammatical Discrimination and Assimilation of Meaning. Although these findings were from Mexican-American youngsters in a bilingual program, they suggest that a fairly strong relationship exists between these two subtests.

A number of hypotheses are put forth to explain this poor showing. First of all, the test format for Grammatical Discrimination is somewhat artificial as compared to the other subtests. Children are asked to select the sentence which sounds <u>wrong</u> even though both sentences offered may convey the same meaning. For example, "They sang very well

---They singed very well." The correct answer to this is the grammatically incorrect sentence. Secondly, most students who achieved mastery on the other subtest have non-standard English language backgrounds. If the child came from a Spanish background, his understanding of English grammar may still be limited. This child would have trouble with examples such as, "They're no here today--- They're not here today."

The TBLC results suggest that by the third grade, the vast majority (over 90%) of the students will achieve mastery on Oral Vocabulary, Sound Discrimination and Assimilation of Meaning subtests and that by the fourth grade on Grammatical Discrimination as well. Therefore, the program objective of making Spanish-dominant students proficient in English will be achieved.

Classroom Observations

These findings are based on the consultant's classroom observations and informal interviews with program staff. Eleven observations were carried out in six of the seven program classes in the winter. One kindergarten class was excluded from observations because it was taught by a new teacher who temporarily replaced the regular teacher. In the eleven classrooms observed, four paraprofessionals took part in classes. Two paraprofessionals were reported to be absent from school during observations. In some cases paraprofessionals were working in classrooms which were not observed.

The consultant's findings are presented in terms of five focal areas; program design, instruction, curriculum materials and classroom facilities, and parent involvement. The emphasis throughout is on educational processes employed by the program to bring about children's learning, growth and development.

Program Design

"Program design" is used here to refer to the general organization of the elements of bilingual instruction, apart from actual instruction. A major feature of the program's design is contrary to accepted practice in bilingual education. Even though some 90% of the children in the program have Spanish as a first language, the program begins reading instruction initially in English. A substantial part of the general rationale for bilingual education for non-native-English-speaking children in the U.S. is to provide reading instruction in the child's native language first, since that is the language that he already knows. The practice of initiating reading first in Spanish, rather than English, to Spanish-speaking children has particularly compelling logic because the writing system of Spanish is much more phonetic and systematic than the writing system used for English. Written Spanish has a very close relationship to spoken Spanish. Consequently it is easily and efficiently learned by those who already know Spanish.

Program management's justification for the practice of introducing reading to Spanish-speaking children first in English is that the high

mobility rate of the student population necessitates such a practice. It is argued that students must be given background in reading English since they are likely to move to areas having only English-teaching schools. No doubt this rationale has merit. However, the evaluators do not have adequate information at present to assess this rationale.

Despite this weakness in design, it was clear from observation that instructional processes were fairly effective. There is little question that a great deal of learning is taking place within the program's present framework, both of English and Spanish as well as through English and Spanish. This is the case because several steps had been taken to correct the possible program weakness described above. First, the program begins instruction at a prekindergarten level. During this year and also during kindergarten, Spanish-dominant children are able to acquire substantial background in spoken English, prior to being introduced to reading in English. Secondly, the Distar language and reading program seems to be well-suited for teaching reading in English to such children, e.g., its initial reading materials utilize partially phonetic writing to get children over some of the hurdles of English symbolizations. Also, Distar prescribes teachers' and paraprofessionals' activities for teaching English and reading in some detail. A number and variety of specific reading techniques, procedures and routines are elaborated for small-group settings. The extensive contact between adult and

child, which are called for by Distar, cannot help but have a good effect on Spanish-dominant children's learning to read English.

The major problem that might result from the practice of introducing reading to Spanish-dominant children in English first is that children may not develop in Spanish (both oral-aural and reading) abilities to the fullest extent. Such children might not develop into balanced bilinguals at the end of the primary grades.

Instruction

During January and February 1973, when all the observations were made, approximately 170 children were registered in the seven program classes. The average class size was 24, with a range from 17 to 29. In the eleven classrooms observed, attendance was 88%, very satisfactory considering that a large number of the students are in prekindergarten or kindergarten. One first and one second grade class seemed to differ rather strikingly from the other first and second grade classes. In one set of classes students have greater bilingual fluency, they seemed to learn more quickly, and they seem to be more socialized to school and less disorderly. The apparent reason for this difference is that one set of classes contains a large proportion of students who had some kindergarten and/or pre-kindergarten in the program, and the other set does not.

The eleven classes observed were devoted to English language arts (4 classes), Spanish language arts (2), arts and crafts (2), and English as a second languge (1). A music lesson by a cluster teacher

and one period of test administration were also observed. The medium of instruction was English in seven classrooms and Spanish in four classrooms. Teachers generally gave each class period in one language or the other. Two teachers, however, alternated to some extent between the two. One teacher gave the first two-thirds of her class in Spanish and then switched to English as a second activity. Most of the teachers maintained a distinct context for learning and using the two languages which is a desirable condition in bilingual language acquisition.

When observed in January and February, instruction in the program was judged to be fairly effective. In the 11 classes observed, 4 were taught very effectively, 4 moderately effectively, and three somewhat ineffectively. Classroom management and organization were found to be very good or fairly good in eight classes, and poor in three. In most classes, students were orderly, cooperative, and courteous in the classroom. Teachers never felt it necessary to raise their voices. In a few classes, students were noisy, incooperative, unruly, and disruptive of the learning of others. In these classes, teachers quite frequently lost patience. Most teachers in the 11 classes made effective use of praise; four teachers, however, did not, or else criticized students excessively.

In conversations with the program coordinator, later in the year, it was learned that additional help was provided to some teachers and that, according to the program director, growth was shown on the

part of these teachers in classroom management and on the part of the children in responding to these teachers.

For approximately 45% of all class time observed, the teachers engaged in whole group teaching; 25% in small-group work; and 15% in working with individual children. The remainder of the teacher's time was devoted to preparing materials, monitoring and supervision, clerical work, and preparation of snacks. Six classes made extensive use of small-group instruction. Several teachers were noted to be particularly effective in having children help other children with academic tasks. Three teachers were observed to make extensive use of open, informal instructional settings; three made some use of such settings; and five made no use of them. In many instances, teachers managed to integrate several curriculum areas into instruction at the same time and did so effectively.

The four paraprofessionals observed in the classrooms spent approximately 30% of their time working with small groups of students, 30% of their time preparing snacks, and 30% working in other rooms in "buddy teaching" situations. The remainder of their time was devoted to preparing materials, monitoring the work of students during whole group discussion, and doing clerical and housekeeping chores. The paraprofessionals seemed to be engaged in useful activities in nearly all clases when they were observed in the classroom.

Curriculum Materials and Classroom Facilities

The program seemed to have an ample supply of instructional materials for all curriclum areas, save possibly social studies. The basic

curriculum guides for each grade level are those of the NYC Board of Education. It was noted that the program had available over a dozen prepared, commercial programs of study and materials for a variety of areas: Puerto Rican culture, social studies, concept development, and Black Studies. Most classrooms had a few language games and the pre-K and K classes had abundant manipulative materials. Most rooms were attractively and appropriately decorated with displays, posters, and illustrations.

It was evident from an examination of teachers' lesson planning books that sound principles of sequential ordering of the curriculum are being employed in the program.

The classroom facilities provided for the program were found to be very satisfactory. Nearly all were large, comfortable, attractive rooms which contained seats and tables of an appropriate size

Parent Involvement

The parent-involvement component of the program appears to be a strong one, due mainly to the efforts of program management and the community liaison personnel. Parent visitation is well-organized and apparently very successful. Beside school visitation weeks, such as for Distar and Open School, the program regularly conducts workshops for parents with children at a particular grade. Parents are encouraged to spend an entire day in the school, observing classes and receiving an orientation to bilingual education and to the program. Grade-level

orientations have been held and others are planned for the rest of the year. Attendance at these whole-day orientations has been at a rate of 40%.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluators believe, on theoretical grounds, that the program's practice of introducing Spanish-speaking children to reading first in English is questionable. Although, in practice, the program directed considerable effort to making this practice an effective one, program personnel should be aware of the possible long-range effect this practice might have on Spanish-speaking children: retardation of Spanish language and reading abilities. Overall, instruction in the program was found to be fairly effective. Student attendance was very good, confirming the observation that children in the program have positive attitudes toward school. Curriculum organization and materials, as well as classroom facilities, were very satisfactory. The strengths of the staff were the teachers' bilingual language competence, their instructional skills, and a program management dedicated to children, their parents, and the local community. The parent involvement component appeared to be very successful.

Considering the overall quality of the program's educational processes, as well as the indications of student achievement, it is recommended this program be continued.

No changes in program design are called for at this time. The

design of a generally effective program should not be altered without clear evidence for doing so.

To improve instruction it is recommended that the emphasis be placed, for in-service training, on basic skills of second-language teaching, effective use of visual aids, greater utilization of the EA by the teacher, more consistent separation of contexts for bilingual language acquisition, classroom management techniques, and motivational techniques.

With respect to curriculum and materials, it is suggested that some thought be given to adapting the Distar language materials so that they will be more useful as ESL material. The Distar language materials introduce a very comprehensive vocabulary but contain a limited number of English syntactic patterns. Also, the Distar language materials do not effectively develop the creative, or expressive, aspects of language. The program coordinator reports however, that other language activities have been developed.

Test results were extremely good. In reading in English, children were on or above expected grade level on the MAT. The DMT results were good. The vast majority of students were properly placed in the program and successfully completing the lessons, but a few students seemed unable to succeed in the program. A review of their situation is advised. Some students seemed to be progressing too slowly through Distar. Their situation also needs review. The Boehm results were also good. Children

were progressing at a normal pace although remaining somewhat below the norm group in language achievement. More teaching emphasis should be placed here. These results may signal a weakness in the Distar language program which is supposed to teach the basic language concepts tested on the Boehm.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION STAFF

OFFICER IN CHARGE: Dr. Dale Bussis

PROJECT DIRECTOR: Dr. Marvin H. Gewirtz

STAFF CONSULTANT: Dr. Rita Senf

DISTRICT ASSOCIATE: Melvin Goldberg

RESEARCH ASSISTANT: Seny Griffin

RESEARCH AIDE: Maria Rijos

PRODUCTION MANAGER: Edna V. Kane

PROJECT SECRETARIES: Margaret J. Castiglione
Mireille Gilsoul
Florence Poy
Lorraine Schorr

CONSULTANTS

Dr. Edward J. Cervanka: Consultant in Applied Linguistics, formerly of Teachers College, Columbia University